

**IN THE DRAWINGS:**

Applicant submits herewith proposed corrections to Figures 3, 5A, 5B and 6 of the drawings. Specifically, as these drawing figures were objected to in the Office Action for being too dark to examine, corrected drawing sheets containing the figures provided herewith. Should any further correction be required, applicant will provide formal drawings. Applicant respectfully requests approval of the corrections to the drawings.

## **REMARKS**

The Office Action mailed December 21, 2006 has been received and reviewed. Claims 1 – 27 have been cancelled. New claims 28 – 39 have been added. Reconsideration of the application as amended herein is respectfully requested.

### **Drawings**

Drawing Figures 3, 5A, 5B and 6 were objected to in the Office Action for being too dark to examine. Corrected drawing sheets containing Figures 3, 5A, 5B and 6 are provided herewith. Applicant submits that these corrected drawing figures address the objections. Should any further correction be required, applicant will provide formal drawings.

### **35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections**

The examiner provided various rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, of claims 1,2, 5-6, 9, 21, 26 and 27 and rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, of claims 1-3, 5-6, 9 and 20-27. The applicant has subsequently canceled all previous claims and added new claims that the applicant respectfully submits are in compliance with section 112.

### **35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Anticipation Rejections**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9 and 20-25 as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by U.S. Patent 5,573,152 to Arnold. ("Arnold"). Applicant respectfully submits that the new claims define over Arnold.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal*

*Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Arnold clearly does not disclosed the claimed invention as it now stands, namely, Arnold does not disclose a shotgun, shotgun sling or any part thereof. Since new claims elements are not present in Arnold, it is requested this rejection be withdrawn and the new claims be allowed.

Likewise, the new claims are not disclosed by the other references either alone or in combination. Thus, the applicant respectfully requests allowance of the claims.

#### CONCLUSION

All pending claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, and a notice thereof is respectfully solicited. Should the Office determine that additional issues remain which might be resolved by a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully Submitted,



Frank W. Compagni

Reg. No. 40,567

Morriss O'Bryant Compagni

136 South Main Street, Suite 700

Salt Lake City, Utah 84101

Telephone (801) 478-0071

Facsimile (801) 478-0076